

# Pachymeres on the ‘Amourioi’ of Kastamonu

ELIZABETH A. ZACHARIADOU

In a recent article Professor Cl. Cahen pointed out various problems resulting from the history of the region of Kastamonu, which on account of its remoteness from the political centres attracted little attention from the chroniclers.<sup>1</sup> One of the problems is the incompatibility of the narratives of the oriental sources and the writings of the Byzantine historian George Pachymeres with respect to some events of the reign of the Seljuk Sultan Masud II: Pachymeres while referring to the history of Kastamonu produces a certain Ali Amourios, his brother Nasir ed-din (*Ναστράτιος*)—a person of lesser importance—and their father, whom he also names Amourios.<sup>2</sup> The same Amourios and his sons are also mentioned by Nikephoros Gregoras, who, however, passes over in silence the sons’ names.<sup>3</sup>

1. Cl. Cahen ‘Questions d’histoire de la province de Kastamonu au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle’, *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* (Journal of Seljuk Studies), III (1971), 145–58; cf. idem, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (London, 1968), pp. 310–12.

2. Georgii Pachymeris, *De Michaelae et Andronico Palaeologis Libri Tredecim*, ed. I. Bekker (*CSHB*, 1835), II, pp. 327–30.

3. They are also mentioned by Laonikos Chalkokondyles and the compiler of the *Chronicon Maius* once attributed to Georgius Sphrantzes. It has been attested that Chalkokondyles’ information derives from Gregoras and that the compiler of the *Chronicon Maius* (sixteenth century) was based on Chalkokondyles. Therefore these two sources will be ignored in the present article. See P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentésche* (Istanbul Mitteilungen, II: Istanbul, 1934), pp. 18–19; R. J. Loernertz, ‘Autour du Chronicon Maius attribué à Georges Phrantzès’, *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, III (Studi e Testi, 123: Vatican City, 1946), 273–311.

Amourios has been taken by historians—unanimously one could say—as a name and more precisely as the Greek rendering of the Arabic name Omur.<sup>4</sup> Analysis of passages from Pachymeres will soon prove that it is a family name deriving from a title.

Pachymeres, himself a contemporary of the events he recounted, mentions Ali when relating the battle of Bapheus; for Ali participated in this battle fighting on the side of the Ottomans. The Byzantine historian leaves the first sentence of his narrative unfinished in order to tell the story from the beginning. Thus he starts a digression which I paraphrase here, keeping as closely to the text as possible. Ali Amourios and his brother Nasir ed-din (the latter once hostage in the hands of the Byzantine Emperor for several years) with the support of the Turks of Kastamonu used to ravage the neighbouring Byzantine territories. The power of Ali became great since the time he killed Malik *Μασούρ*, the son of the Sultan Izz ed-din II, in battle.

At this point Pachymeres starts the story of Malik *Μασούρ*. This Malik *Μασούρ*, sharing the fate of his dethroned father, followed him from Ainos to the Crimea; after his father's death he crossed the Black Sea and reached Kastamonu.<sup>5</sup> From there he succeeded in gaining the favour of the Mongol khan Arghun and he became the lord of the territories which in the past had belonged to his father; he subdued the Turkish amirs of the region whether willingly or under compulsion; but the father of Ali came into contact with the Mongols<sup>6</sup> and obtaining military

4. G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II (Berlin, 1958), p. 216 (s.v. 'Ομάρης); it is to be noted that the confusion between 'Αμούρος—Omur goes back to the manuscripts of the history of Chalkokondyles (see preceding note): in some of them the name appears as 'Ομούρεω or 'Ομάρεω (genitive); but as Chalkokondyles' history was written at the end of the fifteenth century no special importance can be attributed to the *variae lectiones* (Moravcsik, loc. cit.). Moreover it is to be emphasized that many a Byzantine author used to render the Arabic name Omur by 'Αμούρ (Moravcsik, loc. cit.) and this fact leads to further complications.

5. According to Pachymeres, *Μασούρ* at first reached *Θυματήν*. *Θυματήν* or *Θύμηνα* was an ancient town of Paphlagonia; see Flavii Arriani, *Quae exstant omnia*, ed. A. G. Ross, II: *Scripta Minora et Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1968), pp. 116–17; cf. Claudii Ptolemaei, *Geographia*, ed. C. Muller I/2 (Paris, 1901), p. 846 (especially the commentary). In another passage Pachymeres (II, p. 611), repeating the same account, states that *Μασούρ τὸν Εὐξείνῳ διαπεραιωθείς πρὸς Κασταμόνα γίνεται*.

aid from them he resisted *Μασούρ* strongly. He soon reduced him to the point that *Μασούρ* was obliged to flee with his wife and his people and seek refuge with the Byzantine Emperor. *Μασούρ* first came to Herakleia and then Constantinople; but the Emperor happened to be at Nymphaion, and from there he commanded *Μασούρ* to come to his presence. Thus *Μασούρ* left his wife in the capital and, escorted by an officer of the Emperor's service, he set off for Nymphaion. Half way, at Adramyttion, he understood that nothing good would result from his going to the Emperor; therefore he escaped, went back to the Turks and soon recovered his previous power and even more. The father of Ali realized that any resistance to *Μασούρ* would be vain and dangerous. For this reason he went with his seven sons to venerate him, bearing presents and hoping to be accepted into his service. *Μασούρ* received them and he had them killed on the spot by his servants. Ali was lucky enough to survive this family massacre. Then Ali thought that to avenge his family was of supreme importance; for this reason he associated himself with many Turks and he started devastating *Μασούρ*'s territories as a robber rebel. *Μασούρ* marched against him and was killed in the battle. 'These events raised Ali to the "*amourion*" dignity.' From that time onwards he started fighting against the Byzantines.

Pachymeres mentions *Μασούρ* on another occasion when referring to a match planned by the Byzantine Emperor Andronikos II. After repeating part of *Μασούρ*'s story, almost in the same words, and after adding that he has already written about the fate of this man, he gives some brief information concerning *Μασούρ*'s wife and daughter left in Constantinople: the wife was sent to *Μασούρ* by the Emperor after repeated appeals on his part; but the young daughter was left in Constantinople. Andronikos II kept her as a hostage and later he thought of marrying her to a Turkish amir.<sup>8</sup>

6. This change of the Mongol policy will be explained later.

7. As this phrase constitutes a key, I quote it: *ταῦτα τὸν Ἄλῃν ἐπῆρεν εἰς ὄγκον ἀμούριον*: Pachymeres, II, p. 330. On *ὄγκος* meaning also dignity, loftiness, majesty, see Liddell-Scott, *Lexicon*, s.v. *ἀμούριος* is obviously here an adjective; there is no need to write it with a capital letter, following the editor of Pachymeres.

8. Pachymeres, II, p. 591, and mainly pp. 611–12; on the husband to be (irrelevant to this article) see P. Wittek, 'Yazijioghlu 'Ali on the Christian

The episode between Ali's father and Izz ed-din II's son is mentioned by Nikephoros Gregoras in his history, completed approximately fifty years after that of Pachymeres. Gregoras' information is very slight. The Sultan Izz ed-din escaped from Ainos to the Crimea together with his son Malik (Gregoras refers to the son with his title but without giving his name); shortly after Izz ed-din's death Malik crossed the Black Sea and joined the Mongols; with the approval of the latter he went to claim his father's realm. Some of the Turkish amirs received him as their lord and some were about to do so; but one of them, Amourios, started fighting against him and he finally expelled him. Then Malik decided to flee to the Emperor; he reached Herakleia and when spring came he thought of going to the Emperor who was then at Nymphaion. Although he set off he did not arrive there, but he went back trying to recover his father's realm; shortly afterwards he was killed by some murderers secretly organized against him.<sup>9</sup>

1. *The date of the events*: Pachymeres' account differs from Gregoras' much shorter version only in some trivial details; but the two historians disagree with respect to the chronological period during which the events took place. Pachymeres states that *Μασούρ* went to Kastamonu after his father's death: therefore after 1278.<sup>10</sup> He also states that *Μασούρ* enjoyed, at least temporarily, the favour of Arghun and thus offers another *terminus post quem* for the events, namely the year 1284 in which Arghun ascended the throne.<sup>11</sup> Although he relates the events in a digression he includes them in his second book dealing with Andronikos II's reign which partly corresponds with Arghun's period.

Gregoras also places the events after Izz ed-din's death; but he mentions them as slightly preceding the fortification of the Sangarios region by Michael VIII and the restoration of the city

---

Turks of Dobruja', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XIV (1952), 664–5.

9. Nicephori Gregorae, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. Schopen (CSHB, 1829), I, p. 137.

10. On Izz ed-din II see the article Keykâvus II in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (O. Turan).

11. B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran* (Berlin, 1955), pp. 77–83.

of Tralleis undertaken by the junior Emperor Andronikos II:<sup>12</sup> thus he places them around the year 1280.

Both historians state that when the Seljuk prince sought refuge in the Byzantine territories, the Emperor was at Nymphaion. As around 1280 Andronikos II, then co-emperor, resided at Nymphaion for a while,<sup>13</sup> it is necessary to analyse their writings. For, after all, the mention of Arghun could be attributed to a *lapsus* of Pachymeres, and the Emperor, who according to both historians resided at Nymphaion, could be the co-emperor.

This latter hypothesis seems unlikely as nothing in the writings of the two historians suggests—even faintly—the co-existence of two Emperors; but it must be completely excluded if one takes into consideration both the work and the life of Pachymeres.

Pachymeres was not only a contemporary of the events in question but also a close observer of them, being in the service of the palace and of the church. Arghun was not only the khan of the Mongols for the palace circles of Constantinople: his father, Abaka (1265–82), was the husband of an illegitimate daughter of Michael VIII.<sup>14</sup> More important still: Pachymeres' account concerning the last efforts of Michael VIII intended to save Asia Minor from the overwhelming Turkish advance is particularly detailed. As is known, Michael VIII had focused his attention in general on the affairs of the West; and the West during the last years of his reign posed a grave threat. Although the Emperor was very busy in Constantinople receiving papal ambassadors, annihilating opponents of the Union of the Churches, plotting the Sicilian Vespers and waging war in Albania, he could no

12. The exact year of the attempted restoration of Tralleis has not yet been fixed: P. Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et L'Occident* (Paris, 1957), p. 255; at any rate it took place around 1280; see Angeliki E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: the Foreign Policy of Andronikos II, 1282–1328* (Cambridge, Mass. 1972), pp. 24–5.

13. Pachymeres, I, p. 474.

14. Steven Runciman, 'The Ladies of the Mongols', *Εἰς μνήμην Κ. Ἀμάντου* (Athens, 1960), 48–50; cf. βασιλεὺς πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον γαμβρόν, τὸν τῶν Ἀρταρίων δεσπόζοντα διὰ Τουρκίας ὑποκειμένης αὐτῷ: C. Gianelli, 'Le récit d'une mission diplomatique de Georges le Métochite (1275–1276) et le Vat. Gr. 1716', *Scripta Minora* (Rome, 1963), pp. 91–111; R. J. Loenertz, 'Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantine', *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca* (Rome, 1970), pp. 438–9.

longer ignore the Turks.<sup>15</sup> Pachymeres relates many activities resulting from the Emperor's concern for his eastern provinces: he first sent his son and co-emperor Andronikos II to the Meander region. Andronikos' principal occupation there was the reconstruction and repopulation of Tralleis; but the Turks conquered the town shortly afterwards while Andronikos was at Nymphaion. A little later the Emperor himself crossed the Bosporos after having heard that the region of Sangarios was in danger. Before marching against the enemy he was obliged to reside for a while on the Asiatic coast. During his stay there Pachymeres himself went to join him and he had occasion to be in his company every day. Later the Emperor reached the Sangarios region, and, after having it fortified, he went back to Constantinople. In the same year, Andronikos II returned from Asia Minor. Another son of Michael VIII, Constantine, crossed to Asia Minor to replace his father. Shortly afterwards the wife of Andronikos II, who had accompanied her husband to Asia Minor and was left there, died. Her funeral took place in Nicaea and thus Michael went to the capital of Bithynia. Andronikos II was going to revisit the Eastern provinces. Father and son stayed for a while encamped on the Asiatic coast. After Michael's return to the capital news reached him that the Sangarios region was devastated by the Turks; therefore he undertook his last campaign against them. After marching up to the Sangarios he visited Brusa and later Lopadion to inspect the fortifications there.<sup>16</sup>

This information about the activities of the Emperor and the co-emperor is fairly accurate. Moreover it is stated specifically that Pachymeres himself was an observer. There is no mention nor the slightest hint of the Seljuk prince's attempted visit to Nymphaion in connection with the events related above. Consequently one can assume that Pachymeres, when making his digression concerning Ali and *Μασούρ*, is recording events belonging to a different time.

Gregoras' corresponding account is in strong contrast to that of Pachymeres with respect to all this coming and going of the

15. D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp. 305–71.

16. Pachymeres, I, pp. 468–74, 483, 494, 500–5, 523. D. M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453* (London, 1972), pp. 91–3.

Emperor and his sons between Constantinople and Asia Minor. Gregoras mentions three events: one expedition to the Sangarios frontier despatched by the Emperor, the fortification of this region, and Andronikos II's vain attempt to restore Tralleis, captured afterwards by the Turks.<sup>17</sup>

This difference between the two authors can easily be explained: Pachymeres, being a close contemporary observer with an intense interest in Asia Minor, wrote down all the relevant activities of the royal family considered by him as important. Gregoras writing much later, at a time when Asia Minor was definitely lost, gives a résumé of other sources.

Consequently the following explanation can be given with respect to Gregoras' confusion: in one of his sources he found the information concerning Ali's father active in Kastamonu beyond the Sangarios. Perhaps he found it in the work of Pachymeres itself, which has been established as one of his sources.<sup>18</sup> And, considering the events as connected with Michael's expedition to the Sangarios region, he inserted the passage in the corresponding part of his history to make his narrative more consistent.

If his source was Pachymeres' work, his confusion would have arisen from the fact that he had to deal with a digression; for, it should perhaps be repeated, Ali's family story constitutes a digression in the work of Pachymeres.

Therefore an attempt will be made to date the events on the basis of Pachymeres only. The mention of the Emperor's presence at Nymphaion could help us positively. It is known that Andronikos II while Emperor sojourned in Asia Minor from 1290 to 1293: first he went to Bithynia to inspect the fortifications of Sangarios; then he visited Nicaea and Lopadion; finally he reached Nymphaion where he stayed for two years.<sup>19</sup> One would suppose that the events can fairly safely be placed in the period 1290–3.

2. *The word Amourios.* As Pachymeres in his archaic and complicated style states that Ali after his exploits was raised to the 'amourion' dignity, one can be categorical: we are dealing

17. Gregoras, I, pp. 138–40 and 142.

18. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I, p. 451.

19. Laiou, op. cit., p. 79.

with a title and not with a name.<sup>20</sup> In the above mentioned phrase the word *ἀμούριος* constitutes an adjective qualifying the noun *ὄγκος*. The ending of the adjective, *-ιος*, is very common in ancient Greek. If one removes this ending one is inclined to recognize in the remaining word, *ἀμούρ*, the Arabic-Turkish title *amir*. This title, quite familiar to the Byzantines, is usually rendered in Greek by *ἀμιρᾶς*;<sup>21</sup> but Pachymeres himself never uses the term *ἀμιρᾶς* and when speaking of the neighbouring Turkish amirs he uses either the ancient Greek term *σατράπης* or *περσάρχης*.<sup>22</sup> Therefore the rendering of *amir* by *ἀμούρ* does not contradict his own terminology. It is to be noted also that Gregoras does not use the term *ἀμιρᾶς* either.

On the other hand an *Ἀμούρης*, described as a Turkish *strategos* devastating Mesothinia, is also mentioned by Pachymeres.<sup>23</sup> In this latter case one can see how Pachymeres by adding the ending *-ης* makes a Greek noun out of the Arabic title while in Ali's case he makes an adjective, on analogy with *στρατήγιος* from *στρατηγός* or *καισάριος* from *καῖσαρ*.

Amourios does not appear as an adjective qualifying only the noun *ὄγκος* in Pachymeres' text. It appears twice as an adjective following Ali's name (*Ἀλλῆς Ἀμούριος*)<sup>24</sup> and also as an adjective used instead of a noun (a phenomenon common in Greek grammar) with respect to Ali's father, called also *Ἀμούριος*. Pachymeres is supposed to know about this family as one of its

20. This has been already suggested by Professor Cl. Cahen, 'Questions d'histoire', 157.

21. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, pp. 66–8.

22. τοὺς προύχοντας τῶν τῆδε Περσῶν, οὓς δὴ σατράπας ἐκεῖνοι καλοῦσι: Pachymeres, II, p. 328; cf. κατελήπται Ἐφεσος παρὰ τοῦ περσάρχου Σασάν. II, p. 591; Ἰσαὰκ Μελήκ, σατράπης ὢν, qualified also as περσάρχης: II, p. 591.

23. Pachymeres, II, p. 346. This conclusion, i.e. that *Ἀμούρης* constitutes another way of rendering in Greek the Arabic title *amir*, could perhaps help for a re-examination of the Byzantine folk epic poem known under the title *Τὸ ἄσμα τοῦ Ἀρμούρου*. Many an interpretation of the name *Ἀρμούρης* has been suggested; see the relevant bibliography in G. Veloudis, 'Das Armourislied und "Omar al-Aqta"', *BZ*, LVIII (1965), 313–19. Veloudis after establishing that *Ἀρμούρης* is another form of *Ἀμούρης* thinks that it constitutes the Greek rendering of the Arabic name Umur. After analysing the passages of Pachymeres, I think that the view of Kalonaros, that *Ἀμούρης* is another form of the term *Ἀμηρᾶς*, could be correct: P. Kalonaros, *Βασίλειος Διγενῆς Ἀκρίτας*, II, (Athens, 1941), p. 213.

24. Pachymeres, II, pp. 327 and 332.



members, Nasir ed-din, stayed for several years in Constantinople as a hostage. It is clear from his text that Ali's father was an amir (σατράπης); but he is qualified by Pachymeres as the ἀμούριος (the 'amirian' one). Later Ali himself is qualified in the same way. The adjective, having obviously an honorific meaning, is used by Pachymeres with a certain nuance. It implies something more than just simply 'amir' and it should be connected to the family to distinguish it from the others. This last conclusion will serve as a starting point when we attempt to identify this family of Kastamonu.

3. *The name of Izz ed-din II's son Μασούρ*. This name is taken by historians as a slip of Pachymeres (or his copyists) for 'Masud'.<sup>25</sup> They have therefore identified him with Masud who ascended the divided Seljuk throne in 1284. This identification is encouraged by one phrase of Pachymeres, according to which the Seljuk prince in question after his father's death crossed the Black Sea; reaching Kastamonu he started ruling there over these territories as an heir of his father with the consent of Arghun. These facts could be vaguely connected with Masud II's life. But apart from these nothing in Pachymeres' account suggests that he is writing about the son of Izz ed-din II who was a Sultan for several years. He mentions him as a Malik<sup>26</sup> (a title used by all Izz ed-din's sons) but never as a Sultan, while he qualifies Izz ed-din II as Sultan frequently. He states that soon the Mongols turned against him and offered military aid to his opponent, Amourios, so that the prince was obliged to flee to Byzantium; but, such an episode in Masud's life is not attested by any other source, although there are many oriental sources dealing with Masud's reign and his relations with the Mongols. Finally Pachymeres states that the prince in question was killed in Kastamonu; but, as is known, Masud did not end his life in this way.

On the other hand, one can assume that Pachymeres knew much about Izz ed-din's family. Izz ed-din and his family are known to have sought refuge with the Byzantine Emperor and to have stayed first at Nymphaion, later in Constantinople, and

25. The first to suggest that Μασούρ is Masud was J. Mordmann, 'Über das Türkische Fürstengeschlecht der Karasi in Mysien', *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1911), 4.

26. On Malik see Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, p. 187.

finally at Ainos. From there together with *Μασούρ*, as Pachymeres states, he escaped to the Crimea; but other members of his family remained in Byzantine territories: some of them in Berroia and one of his sons, Malik Constantine, in Constantinople.<sup>27</sup> Pachymeres must have known about *Μασούρ*: as we saw, he was deeply involved in the politics of Constantinople around the years 1290–3, when *Μασούρ* was obliged, for a second time, to flee to Byzantium.

Apart from the conflicting historical evidence there is no clear reason to see under the Greek transcription *Μασούρ* the Arabic name Masud. It is much more likely that *Μασούρ* is the Arabic name Mansur. Pachymeres' *Μασούρ* is not the first with this form of name to be found in Byzantine texts: a son of the Seljuk chieftain Kutlumush appears also as *Μασούρ* in the history of Nikephoros Bryennios.<sup>28</sup> A *ν* preceding a *σ* is not a very acceptable combination in ancient Greek, the language used by the Byzantine historians. In most cases this *ν* is either assimilated, becoming a second *σ*, or completely omitted. The Arabic word *manshur*, for example, which should have been familiar to the Byzantine chancery, is transcribed as *μουσοῦριον* by a historian belonging to the court.<sup>29</sup> So instead of presuming that *Μασούρ* is Masud let us accept him as Mansur and try to identify him. It is true that no son of Izz ed-din II is known with this name; but this Sultan had many sons and with respect to their names and their activities the sources give rise to great confusion.

To recapitulate Pachymeres' information: sometime between 1290 and 1293 a son of Izz ed-din called Mansur, and enjoying Arghun's favour, established himself in Kastamonu; some of the Turkish amirs there accepted him as their lord. But one of them, the Amourios, presumably belonging to a distinguished family, fought against him with the support of the Mongols. Mansur, defeated for a while, was finally victorious and had the

27. On the adventures of Izz ed-din II and his family see P. Wittek, 'Yazijioghlu 'Ali', above note 8, pp. 639–63; on his descendants attested in Berroia in the fourteenth century see Elizabeth A. Zachariadon, *Οι Χριστιανοί Απόγονοι τοῦ 'Ιτζεδίν Καϊκαοῦς Β' στὴ Βέροια*, *Makedonika*, VI (1964–5), 62–74.

28. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, p. 183.

29. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, p. 199.

Amourios assassinated. Later the son of the Amourios, Ali, obtaining the alliance of the Turks, killed Mansur.

Do these events reported by Pachymeres fit within the frame of the history of Kastamonu as known through the oriental sources?

It is necessary to give an outline of the history of Islamic Anatolia and especially a summary of the history of Kastamonu in the years 1290–3 corresponding to the time of the events reported by Pachymeres.

The Mongol invasion caused the gradual disintegration of the Seljuk state on the one hand and on the other a large migration of Turcoman population into Anatolia, which settled in the frontier provinces, between the Seljuk and the Christian territories. After the battle of Köse dagh the Seljuk state remained either divided or left to the nominal domination of a Sultan under Mongol overlordship; however, the Turcomans acquired new strength. Before the Mongol invasion, despite some critical episodes, the Turcomans were on the whole kept under control by the Seljuks; but after the defeat of the latter the situation changed. Some of the Turcoman chieftains tried to take advantage of it to win complete emancipation. Others played an important role in determining the political developments during the struggle between Kilidj Arslan IV and Izz ed-din II: the first had the support of the Mongols while the second enjoyed the sympathy of the Turcomans. Seljuk princes, false or real, such as Ahmad the 'Jimri' and Ala ed-din Kaykubadh, took refuge with these Turcomans, challenging the Seljuks and their overlords the Mongols; but their revolts were crushed.<sup>30</sup>

Kastamonu, a frontier province itself, had to suffer all the consequences of the new situation. In the middle of the thirteenth century the town is qualified as 'the Turcomans' capital'. Before 1291 Muzaffer ed-din Yavlak Arslan was the captain general (uç beghi) of these marches; he was a descendant of a noble family, attached for at least three generations to the Seljuk dynasty, and he held the lands as an heir of his father and his grandfather; his grandfather was the Malik al-umera Amir Çoban, beglergeg and possibly governor of the province in the

30. *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 248–53 (O. Turan); Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 234–48 and 270–303.

days of the great Sultan Kaykubadh. Around 1292, a revolt typical of this period is reported in the region of Kastamonu. The rebel is a Seljuk prince, son of Izz ed-din II and brother of Masud II who ascended the Seljuk throne since 1284; he was supported by the Turkish amirs of Kastamonu. Yavlak Arslan, loyal to the legitimate Sultan, was killed during the disturbances but the revolt was crushed.<sup>31</sup>

Nothing more is known about this revolt; moreover the information given by the oriental sources is confused. The exact name of the rebel son of Izz ed-din II remains unknown or at least uncertain in spite of those studies which propose to identify him with any of the numerous sons of Izz ed-din II.<sup>32</sup>

Pachymeres' information obviously concerns this revolt. His corresponding account is by no means exhaustive or explicit. For Pachymeres' purpose was not to relate what took place in Kastamonu but to give a sketch of the background of Ali, who was an enemy, among others, of the Byzantine Empire. But once the events are placed within their chronological context one can understand them. One of the sons of Izz ed-din II called *Μασούρ*, i.e. Mansur, crosses from the Crimea to Kastamonu. Arghun allows him to govern the province while his brother Masud reigns in the sultanate. The fact can be accepted as historically true, for there is a precedent in Mongol policy: some years before Arghun's father, Abaka, thought it might be useful to grant Masud the right to govern the Karamanid territory while leaving the Seljuk throne to Kaykushraw III.<sup>33</sup> Mansur's establishment in Kastamonu should be placed before May 1291, i.e. before Arghun's death.

Once established there Mansur enjoys the support of some of the Turkish (i.e. Turcoman) amirs, a not unusual phenomenon given the circumstances of the period described above. Pachymeres does not state that he revolted; but as in his account Mansur's former patrons, the Mongols, all of a sudden, offer military aid to fight him, one can conclude that the attitude of

31. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 243 and 310–11; idem, 'Questions d'histoire', pp. 153–4.

32. See Osman Turan, *Türkiye Secukluları hakkında Resmî Vesikalar* (Ankara, 1958), pp. 9–12 and 32–33; idem, *Selcuklular zamanında Türkiye* (Istanbul, 1971), pp. 608–9; cf. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche*, p. 22, n. 2.

33. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 294.

the Seljuk prince towards them was not what they expected. Mansur, when first defeated, flees to the Byzantine Emperor but half-way he realizes that he is not going to be well received by him. The reason is obvious: the Emperor wanted to maintain good relations with the Mongols,<sup>34</sup> while the Turcomans were his dangerous enemies. Thus Mansur is obliged to go back where he continues his revolution most successfully. Perhaps he was able to take advantage of the temporary withdrawal of the Mongol forces from Anatolia after Arghun's death followed by a short struggle for the succession on the Ilkhanid throne;<sup>35</sup> but this is mere hypothesis.

The main opponent of Mansur in Kastamonu, according to Pachymeres, is Amourios. It is not unreasonable to identify him with Yavlak Arslan and one is highly encouraged to do so as the identification is already suggested by Professor Halil Inalcik.<sup>36</sup> The reason for which Pachymeres qualifies him as the Amourios is evident: he was not like any other amir of the time but a descendant of Amir Çoban. After all, his grandfather had the title amir inserted between his honorific name and his name. Yavlak Arslan remains faithful to the legitimate Sultan and with the help of the Mongols he fights the rebel; but as the latter consolidates his position he gives up resistance and he tries to go over to the other's service. He is assassinated together with his sons.

Then his son Ali appears. He breaks with his family tradition and he associates himself with the Turcomans. He acts in this way because he believes that to avenge his family is his supreme task; on the other hand, it is to be remembered that, according to Pachymeres, all the Turcoman chieftains did not side with Mansur. Ali kills Mansur. The event must be placed early in 1292 because it is known that by then the revolt is over.<sup>37</sup>

After this achievement Ali together with his Turcomans starts devastating the Byzantine territories, i.e. he becomes a perfect

34. Laiou, *op. cit.*, pp. 175–6.

35. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 298.

36. *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I, p. 267. Some confusion derives from the oriental sources with respect to the end of Yavlak Arslan; an important source, the work of Aqsarayi, reports that it was Yavlak Arslan's father who was killed during the disturbances: see Turan, *Selcuklular zamanında Türkiye*, p. 612, n. 11.

37. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 298–9; cf. *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I, p. 267.

*ghazi* of the marches. Just before the Bapheus battle, he was at peace with the Byzantine Emperor; but when he saw Osman's army including also many Turks from the Meander region he could not restrain himself any longer and he joined the forces of the Ottomans.<sup>38</sup> Three years later when relations between the Mongols and the Byzantines became closer, he appeared willing to pass into Byzantine service, asking for the area near the Sangarios from Andronikos II.<sup>39</sup>

One word about Ali's brother. According to the oriental sources Yavlak Arslan had a son Mahmud whose *laqab* was either Husam ed-din or Nasir ed-din.<sup>40</sup> I think that it can be established now that his *laqab* was Nasir ed-din, as this person can be identified with the Nasir ed-din of Pachymeres who was a hostage for several years in Constantinople. Presumably he survived because he did not participate in the fatal family visit to Mansur, being lucky enough to be absent from Kastamonu and kept as a hostage by the Emperor.<sup>41</sup> Nasir ed-din and Ali, the descendants of Çoban, must be the sons of Amourios, who, according to Gregoras, ruled over the region between Sangarios and Paphlagonia around 1300.<sup>42</sup>

Therefore Pachymeres' account is not incompatible with the oriental sources. And perhaps it is fully trustworthy. At least one son of Izz ed-din II, Malik Constantine, and one son of Yavlak Arslan, Nasir ed-din, lived in Constantinople in Pachymeres' days. News concerning the families of the ex-sultan and the Uç beghi (both of them fathers producing a great number of males) would have reached the capital. Actually the Byzantine author whose complicated style is as obscure as his archaic language adds new information to the data of the oriental sources.

38. Pachymeres, II, pp. 332–3.

39. Pachymeres, II, pp. 459–60; cf. Laiou, op. cit., p. 176.

40. Cahen, 'Questions d'histoire', p. 154.

41. Between the years 1273 and 1275 the Byzantines defeated the Turks of Paphlagonia; perhaps Nasir ed-din was taken as a hostage at that time; see R. J. Loenertz, 'Mémoire d'Ogier, protonotaire, pour Marco et Marchetto nonces de Michel VIII Paléologue auprès du Pape Nicolas III', *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, p. 561.

42. Gregoras, I, pp. 214–15.